DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 631 EA 020 299

AUTHOR Turner, A. Lynn
TITLE The Impact of Educational Reform Legislation on the Instructional Role of ETSSC Principals. Research Monograph.
INSTITUTION East Texas School Study Council, Commerce.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Administrator Role; *Educational Change; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Principals; Role Perception; *State Legislation; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Texas (East)

ABSTRACT

The East Texas School Study Council (ETSSC) (a cooperative organization involving 82 member school districts, a regional educational service center, and East Texas State University) sponsored a study on the impact of Texas reform legislation (H.B. 246 and H.B. 72) on the instructional role of the approximately 400 principals in council member schools. The council is composed of schools from quite small in size (less than 300 students) to quite large (more than 30,000 students) in 19 counties in Northeast Texas. A descriptive survey instrument mailed to the 400 principals in ETSSC school districts was responded to by 314 (78.5 percent) of the principals. The study was designed (1) to ask principals how important the legislative mandates were in terms of increased educational achievement; (2) to determine if the legislation had caused changes in the principal's instructional role; and (3) to identify areas of needed professional development for principals because of the change in role expectations. The second chapter looks at selected literature deemed pertinent to the study. According to the study, principals in the East Texas Study Council schools appeared not to accord the degree of importance to instructionally related mandates as did Texas legislators. Data and findings are included, as well as 49 references. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. L. Turner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Impact of Educational Reform Legislation on the Instructional Role of ETSSC Principals

ED298631

by A. Lynn Turner, Ed.D.

1986
Research Monograph
East Texas School Study Council
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas 75428

EA 020 299

The Impact of Educational Reform Legislation on the Instructional Role of ETSSC Principals

by A. Lynn Turner, Ed.D.

1986
Research Monograph
East Texas School Study Council
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas 75428

3

The Impact of Educational Reform Legislation
On the Instructional Role of ETSSC Principals

Legislators in Texas have been a major force in the educational reform movement in the United States. Even before *A Nation at Risk* and most of the spate of national reports critical of public education were published, the Texas legislature had passed legislation mandating broad curricular changes for Texas public schools. This bill (H.B. 246 of 1981) authorized the Texas Education Agency to set up a procedure for the identification of "essential elements" to be required in all subjects in the curriculum, to specify stringent time requirements for subject areas with special emphasis on the basics, to increase graduation requirements, and to mandate the availability of differentiated curricular paths for secondary students. The mandates of H.B. 246 became effective at the beginning of the 1984-85 school year.

The second major legislative action occurred in the summer of 1984. A Select Committee on Public Education, chaired by the influential computer magnate H. Ross Perot, had been created by the Texas legislature in 1983. The SCOPE report resulted in a 1984 special session for educational reform. A major reform package, H.B. 72, was passed on the last day of the session. The sweeping mandates of H.B. 72 made significant changes in virtually every facet of public schools, including: state governance, finance, teacher and administrator competency testing, exit level examinations, grading and promotion policies, salary structures, discipline management, and the celebrated "no pass, no play" rule in extra-curricular activities. Needless to say, the stress level in Texas schools was high in the 1984-85 school year and has remained high as the mandates have been implemented.

Numerous studies were reported at the national level critical of education during 1983 and 1984, the most influential of which was *A Nation at Risk*. The report waxed eloquent in warning of crisis in America's military and economic position, allegedly due to deteriorating schools. "Common to all the reports is the clear, firm conclusion that American education is experiencing a serious crisis, which, if left unattended, will render the U.S. vulnerable to its industrial, commercial, and even military competitors." (Passow, 1984) The media focused great critical attention on education. Politicians from the President of the United States to governors placed education on the political agenda. Economic interests lined up in support of educational reform. The speed and extent of reform generated was mind-boggling.

A year after publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the United States Department of Education released *The Nation Responds*. Every state by early 1984 had significant and comprehensive educational reforms under consideration or had enacted them. Truly, educational reform had become a national movement. "The American public, after years of dissatisfaction, reaffirmed its faith in American schools, listed education high among its concerns on the national agenda, and supported tax increases tied to improving educational quality." (*The Nation Responds* 1984, p. 15)

Many states including Texas had begun to address educational issues, but the national reports were a great catalyst for change.

> "The national reports are not the only lever for change. Many states have been working on these issues for some time. The confluence of these state and national activities explain in large part the success of the reform movement. Moreover, astute political leaders have seized the nationwide interest to enact education agendas that had been languishing at the state level." (*The Nation Responds*, 1984, p. 16)

Indeed, in a comprehensive analysis of recent reform reports, Passow observed,

> "Exellence" has become the shibboleth of the day. The term has come to mean "higher standards" which are defined as tougher academic requirements, reduction or elimination of electives (which are viewed as

"soft subjects"), more mathematics and science, more homework, more tests, tighter discipline, longer school days and school years. (Passow 1984)

As revealed by the Gallup Poll published annually in the *Phi Delta Kappan*, The views of school leaders and the public often differ significantly on major issues. In examining the 1981 Gallup Poll, Duea (1982), noted "The top three school problems, from the standpoint of the general public, were lack of discipline, students' use of drugs, and poor curriculum/low standards. School officials gave these problems composite rankings at 14th, 15th, and 16th respectively." Interestingly, the same survey revealed that the public and educators saw positive influences on education very much the same. Though the ranking differed, 6 of the top 7 positive influences on school quality were listed by the public and school officials. The items ranked in the top seven by both groups included in the rank order accorded by the public were: well-educated teachers/ administrators; emphasis on the basics; faculty interest in students; good parent-teacher relations; close monitoring of student progress; and an orderly, not rigid, atmosphere.

Perhaps the public schools should have listened more carefully to their publics. The educational reform movement has resulted in most of the public's views being mandated through legislation after public opinion was stimulated by *A Nation at Risk* and other national reports.

The effective schools research of recent years has emphasized the necessity for strong instructional leadership by the principal. Edmonds (1982) a leading effective schools proponent prior to his untimely death, defined five characteristics of an effective school:

(1) The principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction,
(2) a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus,
(3) an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning,
(4) teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery,
(5) the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation

Edmond's definition of an effective school is narrow, "It must bring an equal percentage of its highest and lowest social classes to minimum mastery."

School climate is deemed critical in school improvement studies. Characteristics of a desirable climate include:

(1) Strong principal leadership with effective use of existing resources,
(2) building level intervention, relative autonomy, and faculty collaboration in and support of improvement efforts,
(3) all children are expected to learn with primary concern for improving low income students' achievement or standardized tests.

Edmonds is careful to point out that school effectiveness research has identified "correlates" of effectiveness not causative factors. That is, if the correlates are present then improved learning for the urban poor occurs. The reasons for the gains have yet to be pinpointed. The importance of the principal's instructional role is strongly emphasized. (Edmonds 1982)

The reform movement legislation in Texas appears to have leaned heavily on the effective schools research and its focus on the instructional role of the principal. Brown (1984) indicated, "Two elements are common to effective schools: The high expectations for student achievement and strong instructional leadership from the school principal." Certainly these two elements are prominent among the many instructionally-related matters affected by Texas reform legislation.

The East Texas School Study Council—a cooperative organization involving 82 member school districts, a regional educational service center, and East Texas State University—sponsored a study of the impact of Texas reform legislation—H.B. 246 and H.B. 72—on the instructional role of the approximately 400 principals in council member schools. The council is composed of schools from quite small in size (less than 300 students) to quite large (more than 30,000 students) in 19 counties in Northeast Texas. In many respects the council is a microcosm of Texas school districts.

A careful examination of H.B. 246 and H.B. 72 in terms of impact on instruction was made with twenty-one mandates for schools identified that were considered to be instructionally-related. The status of these twenty-one mandates for schools was somewhat unclear during the 1984-85 school year in that a new appointed state board, which had replaced the old elected state board of education, was slow in issuing policies for the clarification and implementation of the sometimes confusing legislative language. The "no pass, no play" provision was challenged in court and subsequently upheld by the Texas Supreme Court in the summer of 1985.

One could anticipate that reactions to mandates affecting education would be varied, from highly supportive to hostile in some instances. Also to be expected were varying attitudes toward implementation, ranging from moving rapidly at the local level to respond to the legislation (even the less than clear sections) to a purposeful "dragging of the feet." Some educators hoped for relief through a fine-tuning of H.B. 72 in the 1985 regular session of the Texas legislature, which did not occur. Some administrators perhaps did their best to ignore the mandates and hoped that they would go away. With widespread media attention to and great public interest in educational reform, it seemed appropriate to study the impact of the two reform bills on the instructional role of ETSSC principals.

The study was designed: (1) to ask principals how important the legislative mandates were in terms of increased educational achievement, (2) to determine if the legislation had caused changes in the principal's instructional role, and (3) to identify areas of needed professional development for principals because of the change in role expectations.

The data were examined for all principals and by the variables of level of principal assignment (elementary, middle or high school) and by district size. Number and percent of responses were recorded for each item response category.

A three-section descriptive survey instrument was mailed to the 400 principals in ETSSC school districts in the spring of 1985. A follow-up mailing was conducted two weeks after the initial mailing. The response rate in terms of usable returns was 78.5 percent (314).

The second chapter looks at selected literature deemed pertinent to the study. Chapter three displays the data, highlights the findings, and contains conclusions.

Chapter II

Much has been written in recent years critical of public education and advocating various educational reforms. Many of the suggested reforms which are instructionally-related seem to be based on the effective schools research. The first section of this chapter will deal with the literature on effective schools and principals. The second section will examine the educational reform movement literature, including concerns expressed in regard to the often sweeping changes caused by the reforms.

Research on Effective Schools and Principals

The term effective schools has been defined in different ways, but a relatively small body of research has emerged which has popularized lists of characteristics of effective schools. Among the more influential and often quoted advocates of effective schools was Edmonds. His list of characteristics or "correlates" of effective schools with supporting statements included:

(1) Leadership - "Effective principals spend most of their time in the classroom."
(2) Focus - "In an effective organization, the leader articulates its major purposes and then undertakes systematic dissemination." The mission of the school must be broadly understood.
(3) Safe climate - "The school must avoid tangible evidence of institutional neglect...all teachers take responsibility for all students, all the time, everywhere in school."
(4) High expectations - "Teachers who convey the universal expectation of minimum mastery make recitation random."
(5) Close monitoring - "And despite all the limitations of standardized tests, I would agrue as forcefully as I can that they are—at this moment—the most realistic, accurate, and equitable basis for portraying individual pupil progress." (Edmonds 1982)

The basic concept underlying effective schools research is that all children, with few exceptions, can learn and will learn. Brookover (1979) examined the notion advocated by Coleman, Jencks, and others that socio-economic factors were the controlling factors in school achievement with the schools making relatively little impact. An extensive social climate survey of Michigan elementary schools was conducted by Brookover and his associates.

The authors concluded, "Student's academic achievement is not determined by their race, their neighborhood, or their economic status, although such factors may predispose educators to have different levels of expectations. Academic achievement is the end product of a composite of human variables." (Brookover, et al., 1979)

> "In schools characterized by high evaluations of students, high expectations, high norms of achievement, with the appropriate patterns of reinforcement and instruction, the students will acquire a sense of control over their environment and overcome the feelings of futility which now characterize the students in many schools." (Brookover, et. al., 1979)

Brookover and Lezotte (1979) developed a list of characteristics of effective schools similar to that espoused by Edmonds but longer. Their influential book also provides practical suggestions on developing these characteristics at a school site. Brookover, a sociologist, strongly emphasized the school climate with particular attention to the role of the teacher, who must have high expectations for all students. Brookover and Lezotte placed more dominant emphasis on characteristics under the control of the teacher, while Edmonds seemed to place more emphasis on the principal's instructional role. D'Amico (1982) took the position that effective schools may

be unique. He lists the effective school characteristics developed by Brookover and Lezotte, Edmonds, Phi Delta Kappa, and Rutter, *et al.* for comparison. While finding the lists of characteristics to differ, certain characteristics appeared to be fairly common.

Purkey and Smith (1982) found common elements in effective schools research:

> "Two elements in particular appear to be common to effective schools: high expectations for student achievement on the part of school staff members, and strong instructional leadership on the part of the school principal or another staff member. Other elements that are common to a significant number of effective schools include:
> - Well-defined school goals and emphases
> - Staff training on a schoolwide basis
> - Control by staff over instructional and training decisions
> - A sense of order
> - A system for monitoring student progress
> - Good discipline."

Purkey and Smith (1982) sound a note of caution due to methodologies, shortcomings, and inconsistent findings. "While the studies do correspond in several respects, the variations in their findings should serve as a caution to those who would reduce such disparate literature to five or six variables." Yet they conclude, "Flaws in the original research should not discredit the notion of discovering effective school characteristics—seeds for school reform that can be sown elsewhere."

Ralph and Hennessey (1983) undertook a critical review of the effective schools movement and posed questions concerning a lack of theoretical basis to the research. The authors saw the research as flawed by lack of control of socio-economic variables and by observer bias. Replication studies had "failed to support the original findings." The authors felt that coaching or cheating on standardized tests might have affected achievement data. They concluded that, "The effective schools perspective has an important place in educational thinking, but it has been mistakenly identified as a scientific model. We believe it is really a rhetoric of reform. In the guise of positive science, what we find is a set of normative principles."

Cuban (1983) has also expressed caution in regard to the effective schools research:

> "Tied narrowly to test results in mostly low-level skills in math and reading, school effectiveness ignores many skills, habits, and attitudes beyond the reach of paper-and-pencil tests. Educators and parents also prize outcomes of schooling that reach beyond current definitions of effectiveness: sharing, learning to make decisions, developing self-esteem, and acquiring higher-level thinking skills (analysis, evaluation, etc.) and aesthetic sense."

Cuban is concerned about trade-offs likely to occur from strong emphasis on test scores and organizational efforts to promote achievement. "The notion of a single, best curriculum, echoing the pre-nineteen hundred years of public education, reasserts itself." Methodology is also a concern with the emphasis on direct instruction as the "one best system." Since the emphasis is on raising test scores for the inner city poor, he is concerned that the gifted may be neglected and that high scoring schools see no need for improvement.

D'Amico (1982) sees no "recipe" for effective schools.

> "Effective schools do exist. Hundreds of them have been described. Each one's effectiveness, however, seems to represent an intricate, perhaps idiosyneratic, phenomenon that, in turn, is probably the result of in-

tricate, perhaps idiosyneratic, processes. As yet, there are no recipes for creating effective schools."

Walberg (1984) purports to have distilled from the literature nine factors in three areas which most closely relate to learning productivity. The factors are:

Student Aptitude
1. Ability or demonstrated achievement
2. Development or maturation
3. Motivation

Instruction
4. Engaged learning time
5. Quality of instruction

Environmental
6. Home
7. Classroom social group
8. Peers outside of school
9. Television viewing and other use of leisure time

While recognizing the influence of other factors on learning, these nine were considered to be most influential and subject to alteration or influence by educators.

Walberg examined the effect of particular teaching metholologies and specialized curricula on instructional quality. Interestingly, ten of these methods had a greater effect on learning than did instructional time. Socio-economic status was found to have less effect on learning than graded homework or home environment or interventions.

Walberg suggests using both in-school and out-of-school time more efficiently. Improving instructional quality and working cooperatively with parents are considered to be essential for advancing performance levels.

Firestone and Herriott (1982) pointed out a major limitation of effective schools research. "Most of the studies have been conducted at the elementary level and there are systematic organizational differences between levels that seem to preclude generalizing from one to the other." Secondary school goals are considered much broader and, due to specialization, have a more diffuse focus. High school principals have less direct contact with teachers and are not apt to be as able to provide instructional leadership to the more specialized teachers in the secondary school. The size and complexity of a high school make the principal more of an executive facilitator than a coach.

Farrar, Neufield, and Miles (1984) questioned whether effective schools research, done mainly at the elementary level, can be transplanted successfully at the high school level. Their concerns include:

(1) "Elementary school programs focus largely on instruction in the basic skills, an emphasis that is absent in high schools, where teachers have professional allegiances to specific subject matters and skills."
(2) "To implement effective schools programs, high school teachers will have to learn new approaches, not fine-tune familiar practices."
(3) ". . . achievement is a questionable measure of program effectiveness in a high school."

Mazzarella (1985) noted that few studies have been reported on effective high school principals, especially in the instructional area. The author cites the work of Firestone and Wilson in attributing the high school principal's influence to cultural and bureaucratic linkages. The principal exerts influence though affecting attitudes toward the school and the image of the school as well as by policies, procedures, and manipulation of resources.

Another approach is to look at effective behaviors. The work of Russell, White, and Maurer was described where a critical incident technique elicited myriad behaviors considered to be both effective and ineffective by teachers, principals, and students.

Though the sketch of the high school principal from the literature lacks clarity and detail, the importance of what this key administrator *does* is stressed in regard to whether secondary schools are effective. (Mazzarella 1985)

Numerous studies have examined the leadership of the principal as it relates to effective schools, with strong leadership usually considered to be requisite. This viewpoint is reflected by Shoemaker and Fraser (1981),

> "Assertive leadership includes both what the principal *does* and what the principal *allows to happen*. The assertive principal 'runs the school.' Otherwise the school 'runs itself.' Principals who are assertive see that these convictions and philosophy with regard to achievement are carried out."

Mize (1980) studied the effects of principal behavior on academic achievement by comparing high achieving and low achieving schools. She found a significant positive relationship between "strong" principals and high achieving schools, "Rather than merely reacting to situations created by others, these principals, in fact, actively shaped events." She found strong principals to emphasize instructional leadership, to be involved in all school activities, and to be supportive of special projects. Principals in high achieving schools not only introduced new ideas and marshalled support for them with teachers and parents, but also were receptive to new ideas.

In a study of administrative strategies for improving plant performance, Hefflefinger (1983) concluded,

> "Without controlling for climate and structural variables, the economic and ethnic background of students accounts for a significant amount of the variation in student achievement; however, there are factors under the school's control which are significantly associated with the level of student achievement."

The principal had the major role in creating a climate for learning. Academic achievement was found to be related to a positive academic climate in the school. This climate included high expectations for student performance by teachers.

Coats (1984) feels that instructional leadership is not always clearly defined.

> "Each district has to define the 'instructional leadership' term for its unique setting. This is critical in establishing a clear focus, common understanding, and realistic expectations."

The time required for instructional leadership should be recognized.

> "Central office administrators and the board of education need to increase their support, encouragement and assistance to the elementary principals if the principals are to increase the time spent on instructional leadership activities. . . . the principal is generally going to attend to whatever dimension the reward system offers."

A series of studies has been conducted at East Texas State University over the past decade examining the effective principal from a field-based perspective. The Delphi technique was utilized to gain expert consensus on characteristics of effective principals. Abungu (1975) queried principals in small Texas high schools. Stanfield (1977) conducted a study involving elementary principals. Principals of large suburban secondary schools were the focus of Wooley (1977). An analysis of these studies gives an in-

teresting look at the leadership role of the principal. Effective schools research tends to use a fairly global term such as instructional leader or a strong principal. In these three studies, expert principals identified more specific leadership traits for effective principals. Those which ranked high among all three groups included:

(1) Demonstrating good decision-making
(2) Placing the proper people in key assignments
(3) Planning, organizing, and administering the instructional program
(4) Having a thorough knowledge of school operations
(5) Being able to recognize problems before they get out of hand.

It would appear that to be recognized as an effective leader, these characteristics would be critical.

Prine (1983) wondered if the effectiveness traits identified by the large suburban principals in Texas had stood the test of time since Wooley's study six years earlier. She used the top-ranked effectiveness behaviors from the 1977 study and asked large suburban high school principals and their superintendents to rank their importance. All characteristics had stood the test of time remarkably well, indicating consensus as to their continued importance. An equally important finding was that superintendents tend to strongly agree with principals in regard to the importance of these identified effectiveness behaviors. In the school management or leadership group of effective behaviors, the top ranked five were:

(1) Demonstrating good leadership qualities
(2) Demonstrating good decision-making
(3) Placing the proper people in key assignments
(4) Being able to recognize problems before they get out of hand
(5) Being available to faculty and students (Prine 1983)

It would appear that all the above would be critically important to an instructional leader in an effective school.

Horner (1984) field tested a model of school effectiveness adapted from Talcott Parsons by Hoy and Miskell. A battery of tests, the Effective Schools Scale, was validated as reflecting the four dimensions of the model: adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and latency. All four dimensions were found to be related to school effectiveness.

Hostettler (1984) examined the eight basics of managerial effectiveness espoused in the best-selling work *In Search of Excellence* by Peters and Waterman. Hostettler translated the eight basics of managerial excellence into principal behaviors and asked principals and teachers if these characteristics were present in identified effective schools. Using a likert-type scale, he found that teacher and principal means were above 4.0 on all scales. This led him to conclude that, "All eight basics of management were found to be utilized in a substantial way in the schools recognized for excellence."

Parks (1985) emphasized the human relations aspect of management.

> "We cannot realistically assume that school principals continue to serve in the tradition of headmasters—as instructional leaders. A more reasonable expectation is that they are 'people-builders,' helping to create and maintain a work environment that encourages continuous professional and personal growth of faculty, enhances each staff member's self-esteem, and provides opportunity for each staff member to influence the work environment."
>
> Good managers "recognize, appreciate and use the varying thinking and working styles of their faculty and staff rather than judging these differences as undesirable."

We have examined selected, pertinent literature concerning effective schools and principals. Now we wish to look at the educational reform movement which has touched education in all states. This study sought to examine the impact of educational reform legislation in Texas.

Effects of The Educational Reform Movement

The introductory chapter discussed the impact of the major national reports on education in stimulating educational reform. This section will examine the literature in regard to the effects of and reactions to the reforms. The 1970's were a time of national studies on education which had a different emphasis and limited effect on education. Passow (1984) compared the reports of the 1970's with the recent spate of reports.

> "In contrast to the reports of the 1970's, which faulted schools because they did not provide criteria that evolved from students' needs, interests, and concerns, the reports of the past eighteen months fault the schools because they do not have sufficiently rigorous requirements, are mediocre (and worse) in the quality of teachers and teaching, are not educating workers adequately and are doing an especially poor job of teaching mathematics, sciences, and computer technology."

Passow criticized the recent report recommendations as "simplistic, conservative, and unrealistic" and tending to pay little or no attention to schools other than high schools. He sees the major emphases of the report to be "raising standards of achievement, promoting excellence, and rebuilding public confidence in the schools."

To Passow, excellence has been equated with more and tighter academic requirements and increased school time.

Goodlad (1983), principal author of a major national report, basically saw most school reform efforts devoted to raising test scores—a very narrow focus. He sees a great need for clearly delineating and attacking the broader goals of schooling, difficult to measure though they be. If such change is to take place, he sees it done through individual school cooperative efforts involving the principal and teachers. He revives the concept of a small team working with the same group of children for an extended period—*i.e.*, four teachers, one hundred students, four years. He considers meaningful change in teacher methodology to be extremely difficult to achieve and unlikely to occur from outside the local school. "We readily admit the general ineffectiveness of mandated, top-down efforts to change schools....but to such approaches we commonly turn, nonetheless." "We must move beyond narrowly conceived procedures and unimaginative curricula in seeking to create schools responsive to the larger forces that are transforming our lives."

A more stringent curriculum was a focus of the critics and one to which state legislators responded. Brown (1984) states:

> "The Soviet Union, in military development, and Japan, in economic ventures, have become the major competitors of the United States. These countries recognize that world leadership depends on technological superiority, and their school systems reflect this goal. By comparison, secondary students in the United States are not learning enough mathematics and science to allow the country to continue either militarily or economically as the foremost nation in the world. Softness in the high school curricula is putting increasing pressure on the U.S. economy."

Tracking or differentiated curricula for students by type program or diploma at-

tempted has been revived. As Sizer (1983) observed, "People, especially the more affluent people, *like* tracking."

Edmonds (1982) believed that a uniform curriculum is essential, but teachers "must have the widest possible latitude in deciding textual materials, classroom organization, instructional strategy, and the like." When a principal supervises a teacher, he suggests "the collegial offering of alternative ways to teach that particular subject."

Yet not all have agreed with the more narrow instructional focus. English (1986) made a strong plea for curricular balance. He examined the three basic approaches to curriculum—the subject matter, the social utilitarian, and the phenomenological. In his view, the social utilitarian forces are clearly in control during this time of educational reform with its emphasis on accountability and learning outcomes. English is concerned lest we neglect the importance of aesthetics and co-curricular activities.

Matriello, McDill, and Pallas (1985) considered the school reform movement to impact negatively on potential dropouts.

> "Potential dropouts, typically students with limited ability along this one dimension (academic), may have to face repeated failure with little opportunity to engage in other school activities that might afford some sense of success."

Educational reforms should be carefully monitored as to their impact on socially and academically disadvantaged students. "This would prevent policymakers from claiming as successful those reforms that simply rid the schools of students with performance problems." An interesting suggestion was to allow potential dropouts to take a smaller courseload over a lengthened time span, a practice increasingly common in undergraduate collegiate education. (Matriello, *et al.*, 1985)

Another major concern in response to educational reform has been the emphasis on "top down" change. The best seller *Megatrends* questioned the effectiveness of centralization and reported a trend to decentralization, "With the debate over the decline in the quality of education in this country and the recent history of federal and state intervention, the education issue is ripe for increased local initiative." The trend from heirarchies toward networks was also indicated by Naisbett, who questioned the effectiveness of a "top-down power structure." (Naisbett, 1982)

A consistent theme of another management bestseller, *In Search of Excellence,* was the importance of focusing on the worker and a bottom-up emphasis on management decisions. "Managing by walking around" was advocated, recognizing the importance of the worker to the success of the enterprise. The eight basic principles espoused in the book encourage management to decentralize and to stay close to the action. (Peters and Waterman 1982)

Boyer suggested that governing bodies "must find ways to give more participation and more empowerment to those who do the work. Our top priorities should focus on those who meet with children and, especially, on the working conditions of the teachers."

> "It is ironic that while the nation's industries and businesses are encouraging more responsible involvement of the workers, the public sector seems to have it just the other way around. In too many states, we are still trying to fix education from the top, and, in the process, imposing more bureaucracy and control."

The educational reform movement in Texas and most states seems to assume that education is a tightly-coupled organization where central decisions can speedily be implemented. Weick (1982) listed four characteristics of tightly-coupled organizations:

(1) there are rules
(2) there is agreement on what the rules are

(3) there is a system of inspection to see if compliance occurs
(4) there is feedback designed to improve compliance.

In loosely coupled organizations, at least one is missing, usually (2) or (4).

Weick suggests that (2) above is addressed "when the administrator articulates a direction with eloquence, persistence, and detail." He sees schools as loosely coupled and desirably so. It is only on key values that tightly coupled system characteristics apply. All else should be decentralized. Loosely coupled systems tend to be more flexible and adaptable to environmental changes, with greater freedom to adapt at the departmental level than tightly coupled systems.

In terms of (4) above, "administrators must get out of the office and spend lots of time one on one—both to remind people of central visions and to assist them in applying these visions to their own activities." Weick believes that, "The ties in a loosely coupled system are tenuous, which means that the chief responsibility of an administrator in such a system is to reaffirm and solidify those ties that exist."

Sergiovanni (1984) feels that schools should be both tightly coupled and loosely coupled, analagous to Peters and Waterman's (1982) principle of simultaneous loose-tight properties. Sergiovanni states, concerning schools that are both tightly coupled and loosely coupled:

> "There exists in excellent schools a strong culture and a clear source of purpose, which defines the general thrust and nature of life for their inhabitants. At the same time, a great deal of freedom is given to teachers and others as to how these central core values are to be honored and realized. This combination of tight structure around clear and explicit themes, which represents the core of the school's culture, and of autonomy for people to pursue these themes in ways that make sense to them, may well be a key reason for their success."

Manesse (1984) related principal behavior to the concept of simultaneous loose tight properties,

> "While they focus on certain basic goals and have clear accountability, they simultaneously encourage entrepreneurship, autonomy, and a climate conducive to experimentation and continued growth, both for individuals within the system and for the system itself. Staff members feel that their personal goals are aligned with the organizational goals."

McGregor (1960) would consider the above Theory Y managerial behavior, the purpose of which is "to encourage integration, to create a situation in which a subordinate can achieve his own goals *best* by directing his efforts toward the objectives of the enterprise."

Beezer (1982) examined the authority of a teacher to determine classroom practices. He analyzed various federal court decisions and came up with three guidelines designed to balance the teacher's first amendment rights against the state's interests. The guidelines are:

(1) Is the method *appropriate* for school use?
(2) Is it *relevant* to subject matter?
(3) Is it *material* to the proper use of class time?

Teachers appear to enjoy protection if their materials and methods are suitable for the age and maturity of their students and their use does not disrupt the educational process. Clearly the content and strategy must be directly related to the subject taught and not be sectarian or partisan, and must be relevant to legitimate class purposes.

Sizer (1983) made an interesting observation concerning teacher autonomy,

> "If we want to attract and hold top professionals in teaching, we will have to give them appropriate autonomy. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, the trends today are working to weaken the teaching profession. Ever more regulation comes from the top. There is a sort of vicious circle at work: teachers are weak, and therefore they must be regulated; if teaching is heavily regulated, good people will avoid the profession; therefore, teachers are weak . . ."

Engelking (1986) looked at job satisfiers and dissatisfiers in two school districts—Boise, Idaho and Yakima, Washington. The two major satisfaction factors were recognition and achievement. The major sources of dissatisfaction were (1) relationships with students (not following directions, quality of work, behavior and attitude) (2) lack of recognition for achievement or failure to achieve (3) lack of agreement with policy or procedures (especially evaluation) (4) inadequate communication with superiors and peers. Clearly the principal is a major source of teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Not all see the principal's role as critical in instructional leadership. Gersten, Carnine, and Green (1982) viewed the principal's role as important. Yet they believe schools can be effective without principal leadership and activity in the instructional area, provided that leadership *is* provided by teachers, consultants, or supervisors. Principal leadership is highly regarded, "Through visible and clear support, the principal can significantly affect the implementation and institutionalization of educational change." However, the critical elements for effectiveness may come from elsewhere:

> . . . we conclude that effective educational programs in innercity schools can succeed, if (a) teachers are provided with specific, concrete training; (b) the eductional model succeeds with difficult-to-teach students; and (c) there is a system for monitoring student and teacher performance. We believe these factors are critical—regardless of whether or not the principal serves as a strong instructional leader.

Concern has been expressed for reform legislation which has emphasized some type of merit pay. English (1984) distinguished three kinds of merit pay:

1. Performance - tied to measured teacher achievement
2. Differentiated - tied to duties assigned (career ladder)
3. Market-sensitive - tied to availability of certain teachers

English also expressed concern for the evaluation criteria related to one and two above:

> "The search by educators for so-called objective criteria upon which to base a salary model is illusive and non-productive. Ultimately, all criteria are subjective in that they rest upon human judgment, which is susceptible to influence and error."

English sees most merit pay plans as far too stingy to affect retention of outstanding teachers.

> "In the current national context, merit pay is punitive and destructive, and will exacerbate the problems facing teaching rather than ameliorating them. The concept is pretty, the rationale is sweet, but the results are too bitter for the profession, the schools, and the children they serve."

Barber and Klien (1983) question the use of a single evaluation system. "In violation of evaluation theory and often at the expense of their effectiveness, administrators have traditionally tried to use a single evaluation system for both formative and

summative evaluation." For tenured teachers or those who can expect continued employment except for cause, a two-tiered system is proposed. A peer-mediated self-appraisal for formative purposes would be conducted annually. A standard professional review for summative purposes would be used every three years to check on the quality of teaching.

Educational reform has created a need for in-service training. Williamson and Elfman (1982) suggest a four-step approach to in-service training:

(1) creating a staff development committee representative of the faculty and administration
(2) identifying needs
(3) ranking the needs by faculty and
(4) designing an action plan to address the topics, using in-house expertise, if possible.

The effects of educational reform have been felt in all states. While many reforms have been applauded, others have been questioned, as well as the approaches used for the implementation of reforms. This study sought the views of principals on school reforms in Texas.

Chapter III

A descriptive survey instrument was devised and sent to the four hundred principals in ETSSC schools in the spring of 1985. The first section of the instrument listed the twenty-one instructionally-related mandates gleaned from Texas education reform legislation and asked principals to indicate the degree of importance assigned each in regard to educational achievement. A five point importance scale was scored: none (1), some (2), moderate (3), high (4), and very high (5). The degree of importance placed by principals on a mandated change was expected to affect commitment to the anticipated change. Great interest in the study was demonstrated by the high rate of return (78.4%) and by the numerous unsolicited comments added by principals to emphasize their sometimes quite strong feelings about particular changes.

Table I lists the twenty-one mandates and the degree of their importance as seen by the ETSSC principals who responded. The percentage of responses is given by category of importance. Mean scores are also given which can be used for ranking purposes. The following mean score range was considered indicative of the importance placed by principals on each change: none (1.0 to 1.49), some (1.5 to 2.49), moderate (2.5 to 3.49), high (3.5 to 4.49), and very high (4.5 to 5).

The major impression received from an examination of Table I is that ETSSC principals do not see most of the mandates as being nearly as important as did Texas legislators. Only eight of the twenty-one were regarded as being of high importance. One can surmise that it would be difficult to work up enthusiasm toward addressing mandates that were considered to be of moderate importance or less. As Peters and Waterman have observed in their best-selling *In Search of Excellence,* top-down change is apt to meet resistance and is not a hallmark of managerial excellence. This view is held by Naisbett, who has documented that major lasting change is typically "bottom-up" rather than top down.

Among the eight items considered by principals as being above moderate in importance were four involving curricular planning (items 2, 1, 4, 3). The other important items were concerned with raising standards (5), increasing instructional time (6) increasing teacher evaluation frequency (17) and developing a discipline management plan (16). Of the five lowest ranked items, four required increased paperwork (14, 12, 15, and 20) and one restricts disciplinary alternatives (9). Considering that "top down" change is apt to be less productive than that involving those on the bottom of the heirarchy, it appears that principals may not be strongly committed to attaining the legislative mandates.

Consider carefully the distribution of ratings on each item. A great lack of consensus is apparent with importance ratings varying from "none" to "very high" on every item. As individual school system scores were examined, this lack of consensus also was obvious. Central office administrators should be aware of this wide divergence in views among principals, which could complicate implementing and/or monitoring these legislative mandates.

The study examined the data in light of the following variables: the level of principal assignment (elementary, middle school, high school) and the size of the school by four University Interscholastic League classifications.

The data in Tables II and III address these variables. No important difference was found in ratings of importance of legislative mandates in regard to the principal's assignment in elementary, middle school, or high school. An important difference was considered to be 1.0 or greater, a full rating classification or more. As can be determined in Table II, a comparison of rankings of importance shows remarkable consensus among the three princpal groups. This is of particular interest in that, nationwide, educational reform has tended to focus more on high schools (see *The Nation Responds*) and could be expected to be of greater concern to secondary principals. In Texas, principals at all levels have felt significant impact from the two major reform bills.

Table I
Responses of Principals Indicating Degree of Importance Placed on Legislative Mandates as Related to Increased Educational Achievement
N = 300

	Degree of Importance % Responding					
	Very High 5	High 4	Moderate 3	Some 2	None 1	Mean
1. Developing campus educational objectives	28.7	43.0	20.7	5.0	2.7	3.90
2. Integrating the essental elements into curriculum guides	37.0	39.7	16.7	5.3	1.3	4.06
3. Including objectives related to essential elements in teacher lesson plans	25.0	37.0	24.7	10.7	2.7	3.71
4. Improving scope and sequence of curricular objectives by grade level	26.0	44.7	21.3	5.7	2.3	3.85
5. Raising standards for passing courses and for promotion	28.3	40.0	23.7	4.7	3.3	3.85
6. Providing for increased instructional time with fewer disruptions	35.3	39.7	16.0	4.0	5.0	3.96
7. Providing a tutorial program	17.0	27.3	31.0	16.3	8.3	3.28
8. Providing remedial instruction in summer school for students failing and/or not achieving essential elements	10.7	33.0	29.7	14.3	12.3	3.15
9. Providing in-school suspension or home instruction as an alternative to suspension from school	14.3	25.0	25.0	13.3	22.3	2.96
10. Limiting and monitoring unexcused absences for receiving credit	16.0	37.7	28.3	12.0	6.0	3.46
11. Limiting and monitoring absences from school for extra-curricular activities	15.7	32.7	26.3	13.7	11.7	3.27
12. Limiting and monitoring hours of participation in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities outside of school hours	9.0	23.7	32.7	19.3	15.3	2.92
13. Reporting to parents more frequently on student progress	17.3	28.7	33.3	13.7	7.0	3.36
14. Mailing follow-up letters and/or duplicate cards in an effort to secure parent signature on report cards	9.3	18.0	36.3	16.0	20.3	2.80

15. Scheduling at least two parent-teacher conferences each year	11.7	25.0	31.0	20.3	12.0	3.04
16. Developing a discipline management plan	20.0	38.0	22.0	12.7	7.3	3.51
17. Increasing teacher evaluation frequency and correlating with at least one other appraiser	21.7	39.7	23.3	12.3	3.0	3.65
18. Providing for a career ladder for teachers	19.7	21.7	22.7	18.0	18.0	3.07
19. Developing criteria for career ladder placement	22.7	27.3	22.3	13.7	14.0	3.31
20. Devising a report on building level program effectiveness	5.3	29.7	38.0	18.0	9.0	3.04
21. Increasing academic requirements for participation in extra-curricular activities	14.0	27.3	33.3	12.7	12.7	3.17

Degree of Importance

None 1 to 1.49
Some 1.5 to 2.49
Moderate 2.5 to 3.49
High 3.5 to 4.49
Very High 4.5 to 5.00

Table II
Mean Principal Responses of
Importance Ratings of Legislative Mandates

Items	N = 171 Elem.	N = 56 Middle	N = 72 High
1.	3.88	3.86	3.97
2.	4.03	3.91	4.22
3.	3.63	3.71	3.89
4.	3.83	3.91	3.92
5.	3.80	3.97	3.92
6.	3.98	3.91	3.97
7.	3.32	3.05	3.38
8.	3.13	3.32	3.07
9.	2.97	2.86	3.01
10.	3.42	3.45	3.56
11.	3.13	3.18	3.68
12.	2.88	2.82	3.08
13.	3.35	3.38	3.40
14.	2.87	2.55	2.83
15.	3.39	2.71	2.44
16.	3.36	3.30	3.38
17.	3.64	3.59	3.71
18.	3.09	2.93	3.14
19.	3.33	3.14	3.38
20.	3.14	2.89	2.93
21.	3.11	3.00	3.46

Important difference = 1.00 or greater

Table III
Mean Principal Responses to Importance Ratings of Legislative Mandates by School Size

Item	AA	AAA	AAAA	AAAAA
1.	4.00	3.98	3.81	3.87
2.	4.21	3.96	4.21	3.96
3.	3.82	3.54	3.88	3.67
4.	3.94	3.93	3.92	3.74
5.	3.85	3.96	3.82	3.75
6.	3.97	4.14	3.79	3.92
7.	3.44	3.11	3.14	3.43
8.	2.97	3.00	3.08	3.39
9.	2.88	2.88	2.76	3.19
10.	3.41	3.53	3.13	3.65
11.	3.32	3.48	2.96	3.25
12.	2.74	3.00	2.85	2.98
13.	3.44	3.29	3.25	3.48
14.	2.71	2.82	2.78	2.82
15.	2.76	2.76	2.93	3.44
16.	3.44	3.39	3.54	3.58
17.	3.74	3.56	3.64	3.64
18.	3.24	2.68	3.04	3.23
19.	3.47	2.93	3.32	3.60
20.	3.18	2.98	3.13	3.00
21.	3.18	3.33	3.07	3.07

Degree of Importance
None 1 to 1.49
Some 1.5 to 2.49
Moderate 2.5 to 3.49
High 3.5 to 4.49
Very High 4.5 to 5.00

The size of school could logically affect the importance principals place on education "reform." However, when importance ratings of principals were examined by four University Interscholastic League size categories, no important differences were noted on any item (Table III). Pursuant to a discussion with Dr. Bill Parrish at the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the data were examined in terms of randomly selected individual school systems in a size category. Table IV looks at the number of important differences (1.0 or more) between school system means in a size category. Important differences were found in all size categories on a majority of the twenty-one items in part one of the instrument. Four mean differences were 2.5 or above—essentially polar differences. These school system differences could have been influenced by the attitude of central administration to the legislative mandates. If so, it would appear that central administrative attitudes could be critical in terms of implementing legislative change.

Table IV
Important Mean Differences (1.00 or above) on Importance Mandates as Seen by Principals Between School Systems in A Size Category

Item	AA	AAA	AAAA	AAAAA
		1.		
		1.50		
		1.20		
2.	1.50			1.03
3.	1.67	1.50		1.47
4.	1.00	2.00		1.14
5.			1.60	1.18
6.	1.50		1.40	
7.	1.50	2.67		1.29
8.	1.50		1.50	1.50
9.	2.00	1.33		1.68
10.	1.00	2.00		1.00
11.	1.00		2.40	
12.	1.50	1.00	1.80	
13.	2.00	2.17	1.00	
14.	3.00	2.00		1.59
15.	1.50	1.83	1.00	
16.	2.00	1.50	1.40	1.05
17.	2.00	1.83		
18.	1.00	1.33	1.50	1.51
19.	1.00			1.21
20.	2.50	1.33		1.29
21.	2.50	1.50	2.20	
Number of Important Differences	**20**	**14**	**11**	**13**

Degree of Change in Instructional Role

The second objective of the study was to ascertain the reported degree of change in instructional role caused by H. B. 246 and H. B. 72. Twenty-five instructional behaviors of principals were listed and principals were asked to indicate the degree of change caused by educational reform legislation in Texas. The degree of change was indicated as: Much More (5), More (4), No Change (3), Less (2), and Much Less (1). The following mean score range is indicative of the degree of change principals reported caused by legislative reform: Much Less (1.00 to 1.49), Less (1.5 to 2.49), No Change (2.5 to 3.49), More (3.5 to 4.49) and Much More (4.5 to 5).

Table V displays data for the twenty-five instructionally-related role behaviors. Change (more time spent) has been reported in eighteen of the twenty-five role aspects. Apparently educational reform has brought about change. Interestingly the greatest change was indicated for item 19, "handling paperwork that is unrelated to improving instruction." However, more time is being given to behaviors related to helping teachers improve instruction (17, 21, 18), to focusing on academics (13) to participating in professional meetings concerning instruction, and (2) to controlling intrusions. Somewhat surprisingly, utilizing clinical supervision (10) and reading about instruction (11) indicated "no change." Whether this indicates no change in behavior was needed or whether time did not allow change is uncertain, but likely the latter. Full implementation of required new evaluation procedures will likely cause significantly increased clinical supervision activities.

It should be noted in Table V that less divergence exists in reported change than was seen in importance ratings of mandates. Also, few principals reported less time given to a role aspect.

Table V
Changes in Time Spent by Principals on Instructionally Related Behaviors Resulting from Legislative Mandates
N = 300

	Degree of Change % Responding					
	Much More 5	More 4	No Change 3	Less 2	Much Less 1	Mean
1. Devoting class time to instruction (time on task)	11.3	57.0	28.7	2.7	.3	3.76
2. Controlling "intrusions" (announcements, money-raising activities, pep rallies, activities during the school day)	19.3	46.7	29.3	3.7	1.0	3.90
3. Grouping students by ability	3.3	14.3	79.0	2.7	.7	3.17
4. Teaming teachers	1.0	8.0	86.3	3.3	1.3	3.04
5. Individualizing instruction	2.3	30.7	65.0	1.0	0.0	3.33
6. Articulating curriculum between building levels (elementary to middle school, middle school to high school)	4.7	45.3	49.0	1.0	0.0	3.54
7. Teaching basic skills as measured by TABS	6.7	45.7	47.0	.3	.3	3.58
8. Teaching affective areas such as values, self-concept, cultural differences	2.3	18.0	74.3	4.3	1.0	3.16
9. Monitoring student achivement of curricular objectives	7.0	50.0	42.3	.7	0.0	3.63
10. Utilizing clinical supervision	5.0	30.7	61.3	2.0	1.0	3.37
11. Reading articles or books related to instruction	5.7	41.7	48.3	3.7	.7	3.48
12. Maintaining high expectations for student achievement	11.7	51.0	36.7	.7	0.0	3.74
13. Focusing on academics at the building level	12.7	55.7	31.7	0.0	0.0	3.81
14. Dealing with discipline problems	11.7	28.7	55.0	3.7	1.0	3.46
15. Sharing information and materials on instruction with teachers	9.3	52.0	37.3	1.3	0.0	3.69
16. Participating in professional meetings concerning instruction	15.3	52.7	29.3	2.7	0.0	3.81
17. Basing teaching evaluation on instructional skills	13.3	60.7	26.0	0.0	0.0	3.87
18. Discussing instructional issues in faculty meetings	12.3	56.7	28.3	2.7	0.0	3.79

19. Handling paperwork that is unrelated to improving instruction	29.3	40.0	26.3	2.7	1.7	3.93
20. Emphasizing instructional effectiveness in in-service programs	9.0	60.0	30.0	1.0	0.0	3.77
21. Helping teachers individually to improve teaching	10.7	63.3	24.3	1.0	.7	3.82
22. Providing resources for teaching supplies, materials, and equipment	3.3	44.0	51.7	1.0	0.0	3.50
23. Encouraging teachers and praising good instructional behavior	13.0	50.7	35.0	.7	.7	3.75
24. Seeking greater parental and community involvement with your school	15.7	47.0	36.3	1.0	0.0	3.77
25. Planning, both long-range and short-range, to tailor the educational program in your building to meet identified needs of your students	11.3	54.7	33.7	.3	0.0	3.77

Degree of Change

Much Less 1.00 to 1.45
Less 1.50 to 2.49
No Change 2.50 to 3.49
More 3.50 to 4.49
Much More 4.50 to 5.00

When examining the data by the position of the principal (elementary, middle school, high school), little difference was found on any item (Table VI). Again, this is somewhat surprising in terms of national trends where secondary principals appear to be most affected by reform legislation (Keller, 1985). No important differences were found among principals due to size of school regardless of the type school served (Table VII). However, the picture changes when viewing differences between school sytems in a size category. Again as seen in Table VIII, important differences were found between school system item means in all size categories. For some difficult to determine reason, less divergence existed in AAAA school systems than other size categories. Again the leadership of the central administration may explain these differences between school system item means. As Achilles (1985) has observed, "The key to principal involvement in instructional behaviors is assigning instruction as a top priority at the central office level." Wide divergence also existed *within* school systems in terms of reported change. Reported time devoted to instructional behavior, a measure of change, varied from "much less" to "much more" among principals in the same school system. This finding should interest central office personnel who perceive that instructional behaviors of system principals are relatively consistent.

Table VI
Degree of Change in Time Spent on
Instructionally-Related Activities by Principals

Rank	Elem.	Middle	High
1.	3.74	3.73	3.85
2.	3.72	3.73	4.03
3.	3.14	3.13	3.26
4.	3.08	3.02	2.96
5.	3.35	3.32	3.29
6.	3.46	3.52	3.74
7.	3.58	3.59	3.57
8.	3.21	3.11	3.10
9.	3.58	3.75	3.67
10.	3.38	3.44	3.28
11.	3.49	3.50	3.44
12.	3.74	3.71	3.74
13.	3.77	3.77	3.94
14.	3.39	3.75	3.42
15.	3.68	3.70	3.71
16.	3.84	3.71	3.81
17.	3.89	3.77	3.90
18.	3.83	3.64	3.78
19.	3.89	3.93	4.01
20.	3.78	3.77	3.74
21.	3.85	3.79	3.78
22.	3.56	3.36	3.46
23.	3.77	3.70	3.72
24.	3.74	3.77	3.83
25.	3.75	3.73	3.83

Degree of Change
Much Less 1.00 to 1.45
Less 1.50 to 2.49
No Change 2.50 to 3.49
More 3.50 to 4.49
Much More 4.50 to 5.00

Table VII
Degree of Change in Principal Time given to
Instructionally-Related Activities as Related to School Size

Item	AA	AAA	AAAA	AAAAA
1.	3.79	3.69	3.68	3.85
2.	3.82	3.78	3.69	3.83
3.	3.35	3.13	3.14	3.17
4.	3.06	2.98	3.04	3.08
5.	3.09	3.00	3.04	3.06
6.	3.71	3.68	3.50	3.33
7.	3.68	3.58	3.54	3.55
8.	3.26	3.16	3.18	3.14
9.	3.71	3.69	3.53	3.64
10.	3.32	3.44	3.22	3.43
11.	3.44	3.46	3.40	3.55
12.	3.94	3.65	3.60	3.82
13.	3.97	3.78	3.75	3.81
14.	3.59	3.41	3.35	3.54
15.	3.91	3.74	3.51	3.66
16.	4.03	3.76	3.83	3.70
17.	3.94	3.94	3.81	3.83

18.	3.94	3.72	3.78	3.76
19.	3.91	4.12	4.01	3.74
20.	3.79	3.80	3.69	3.77
21.	4.00	3.78	3.72	3.88
22.	3.59	3.36	3.49	3.55
23.	3.82	3.67	3.67	3.82
24.	3.88	3.75	3.72	3.74
25.	3.94	3.81	3.66	3.73

Degree of Change

Much Less 1.00 to 1.45
Less 1.50 to 2.49
No Change 2.50 to 3.49
More 3.50 to 4.49
Much More 4.50 to 5.00

Table VIII

Important Mean Differences (1.0 or more) on Degree of Change on Time Given to Instructional Behaviors as Seen by Principals When Comparing Selected Schools Within A Size Category

Item	AA	AAA	AAAA	AAAAA
1.		1.50		
2.	1.00	1.17		
3.	1.00			1.25
4.	1.00	1.50		
5.	1.00	2.00		1.05
6.		1.00		
7.	2.00	1.00		
8.	1.00			
9.	1.00	1.50		
10.	1.50	1.00		
11.	1.00	1.33		1.04
12.	1.33	1.00	1.15	
13.		1.00		
14.	2.00	1.00		1.01
15.	1.00			
16.	1.50		1.25	1.12
17.	1.00	1.50		1.18
18.	1.00	1.00		1.05
19.	1.50	1.17	1.00	
20.		1.00		1.04
21.		1.50		1.04
22.				
23.	1.00	1.50	1.27	1.05
24.	1.00	1.17	1.00	1.05
25.				
Number of Differences	**18**	**19**	**4**	**12**

Expressed Need for Further Instruction-Related Training

The third section of the instrument addressed the need for "further training or sharpening of skills" brought about by changes in instructional role. The data show an important expressed need in each area addressed. Table IX reports the indicated need for further training. The top four need items were noted by more than half of the principals with teacher evaluation process and criteria reported by 74.3 percent and 70.0 percent of principals. Help in teacher morale (59 percent) and teacher motivation (55.7 percent) ranked next. *All four of the top need areas are directly related to the required implementation of a career ladder in Texas schools.* The fifth ranked item, clinical supervision (48.9 percent) relates closely to career ladder concerns. The range of expressed need for training varied from 21.0 percent to 39.7 percent on the other four areas listed. The "other" category yielded responses from 3 percent of the principals, but no pattern of responses was indicated.

Table IX
Percent of Principals Indicating Need for Further Training by Type Position and for All Principals

	All Elem	Middle	High	Principals
1. Teacher evaluation criteria (identifying desired teaching characteristics)	71.4	66.1	72.2	70.0
2. Teacher evaluation process (how to go about effective evaluation)	74.3	75.0	73.6	74.3
3. Clinical supervision (working with teachers needing help)	45.6	53.6	42.8	48.7
4. Discipline management	25.1	37.5	37.5	30.3
5. Teacher morale	55.0	64.3	65.3	59.0
6. Curriculum development	32.7	42.9	38.9	36.3
7. Program evaluation	25.7	35.7	29.2	28.7
8. Time management	33.9	50.0	45.1	39.7
9. Communication	21.1	25.0	18.1	21.0
10. Motivation of teachers and students	49.7	64.3	62.5	55.7
11. Other (specify)	2.9	5.4	1.4	3.0

Summary

To summarize this study, principals in the East Texas Study Council schools appeared not to accord the degree of importance to instructionally-related mandates as did Texas legislators. This is not surprising in that the changes were "top down" and came with limited input from educators. The degree to which change was reported indicates that more time is being devoted to particular instructional behaviors since passage of H. B. 246 and H. B. 72. Neither importance ratings of legislative mandates nor degree of change in instructional role were found to be related to the principal's position or the size of school system where employed. Perhaps the most interesting finding of the study was the apparent effect central office attitudes toward legislative mandates had toward principals' view of their importance. The degree of reported change among school systems appeared related to central office leadership. That implementation of a career ladder for teachers and other changes have caused an expressed need for further training is evident. Both pre-service and in-service training must address these needs made pressing by legislative reform.

Bibliography

Abungu, Cornelio O. 1975. "A Delphi Study to Determine Factors Which Contribute to Success in Administration of AA High Schools in Texas." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University.

Achilles, Charles. May, 1985. Personal Interview at University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Barber, Larry W. and Klein, Karen. December, 1983. "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 247-251.

Beezer, Bruce. May, 1982. "How Extensive is Teacher Authority to Determine Classroom Methodology." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 615-618.

Boyer, Ernest L. March, 1985. "In the Aftermath of Excellence." *Educational Leadership*, pp 10-13.

Brookover, Wilbur, Beady, Charles, Flood, Patricia, Schweitzer, John, and Wisenbaker, Joe. 1979. *School Social Systems and Student Achievement*. Bergin.

Brookover, W. B. and Lezotte, L. W. 1979. *Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement*. Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education. Michigan State University.

Brown, B. Frank. 1984. *Crisis in Secondary Education*. Prentice-Hall, p. 32, p. 67.

Coates, Charollene M. 1984. "An Examination of the Elementary Principal as Instructional Leader." Unpublished Dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1984.

Cuban, Larry. June, 1983. "Effective Schools: A Friendly But Cautionary Note." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 695-696.

D'Amico, Joseph. December, 1982. "Each Effective School May Be One of a Kind." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 61-62.

Duea, Jerry. May, 1982. "School Officials and the Public Hold Disparate Views on Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 477-479.

Edmonds, Ronald R. December, 1982. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 4-11.

_____ December, 1982. "On School Improvement: A Conversation With Ronald Edmonds," *Educational Leadership*, pp. 13-15.

Engelking, Jeri L. Winter, 1986. "Teacher Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction." *ERS Spectrum*, pp. 33-37.

English, Fenwick W. January, 1984. "Merit Pay: Reflections on Education's Lemon Tree." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 72-79.

_____ Winter, 1986. "Balance in The Cirriculum: Today's Directions and Dilemmas." *ERS Spectrum*, pp. 9-15.

Farrar, Eleanor, Neufeld, Barbara, and Miles, Matthew B. June, 1984. "Effective Schools Programs in High Schools: Social Promotion or Movement by Merit." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 701-706.

Firestone, William and Herriott, Robert. December, 1982. "Prescriptions for Effective Elementary Schools Don't Fit Secondary Schools." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 51-53.

Gersten, Russell, Carnine, Douglas, and Green, Susan. December, 1982. "The Principal an Instructional Leader: A Second Look." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 47-50.

Goodlad, John I. April, 1983. "A Study of Schooling: Some Implications for School Improvement." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 552-558.

Hefflefinger, Sharon I. 1983. "Administrative Strategies for Improving Student Performance," Unpublished Dissertation, University of Minnesota, pp. 86-96.

Horner, Judith A. 1984. "School Effectiveness: A Conceptual Framework, Measures and Results from a Study of New Jersey Secondary Schools." Unpublished Dissertation, Rutgers University.

Hostetler, Ronald E. 1984. "In Search of Excellence: To What Extent Is There Agreement Between Leadership Behavior in America's Best Run Companies and America's Most Effective Schools?" Unpublished Dissertation, Ball State University.

Keller, Edward. May, 1985. Personal Interview at Arlington, Virginia.

McGregor, Douglas. 1960. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw-Hill, New York, p. 61.

Levine, Daniel U. and Stark, Joyce. December, 1982. "Instructional and Organizational Arrangements That Improve Achievement in Inner- City Schools." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 41-46.

Mazzarella, JoAnn. Winter, 1985. "The Effective High School Principal: Sketches for a Portrait." *R & D Perspectives*. Center for Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Mize, Rita L. 1980. "The Effects of Principal Behavior Upon Achieving Teacher Performance in High Achieving and Low Achieving Schools." Unpublished Dissertation, University of California, Berkley.

Naisbett, John. 1982. *Megatrends*. Warner.

Natriello, Gary, McDill, Edward L., and Pallas, Aaron N. September, 1985. "School Reform and Potential Dropouts." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 10-14.

National Commission on Excellence. 1983. *A Nation at Risk: The Importance of Educational Reform*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Parks, A. Lee. April, 1985. "RX for Managers." *American School and University*, pp. 33-35.

Parrish, William. May, 1985. Personal Interview at Reston, Virginia.

Passow, A. Harry. June, 1984. "Tackling the Reform Reports of the 1980's." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 674-683.

Peters, Thomas J. and Waterman, Robert H. 1982. *In Search of Excellence*. Harper and Rowe.

Prine, Brenda J. 1983. "The Importance of Certain Factors Related to The Success of Principals of Large High Schools as Rated By Principals and Superintendents." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Smith, Marshall S. December, 1982. "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 64-69.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Degen, Susan. Spring, 1985. "Beyond Effective Schools to Good Schools: Some First Steps." *R & D Perspectives*. Center for Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Ralph, John H. and Fenessey, James. June, 1983. "Science or Reform: Some Questions About the Effective Schools Model." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 689-694.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. February, 1984. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 4-13.

Shoemaker, Joan and Fraser, Hugh. November, 1981. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implicatons from Studies of Effective Schooling." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 178-182.

Sizer, Theodore. June, 1983. "High School Reform: The Need for Engineering." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 679-683.

Stanfield, David P. 1977. "Characteristics of Successful Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University.

United State Department of Education. 1984. *The Nation Responds*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Walberg, Herbert J. May, 1984. "Improving the Productivity of America's Schools." *Educational Leadership*, pp. 19-27.

Weick, Karl E. June, 1982. "Administering Education in Loosely Coupled Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 673-676.

Williamson, Peter A. and Elfman, Julia A. February, 1982. "A Commonsensse Approach to Teacher Inservice Training." *Phi Delta Kappan*, p. 401.

Wooley, Don P. 1977. "A Delphi Study to Determine Success Factors Indentified by AAAA Principals in Texas." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University.